

Assessment of the Anna Janoušková's bachelor's thesis:

## Reflection of the Adaptation Process of American Missionaries in the Czech Republic

The bachelor's thesis of Anna Janoušková deals with an interesting and insufficiently researched phenomenon, namely with the groups of American Evangelical missionaries, that spent some time period in Bohemia after 1989. The phenomenon is a suitable object of anthropological research, from both viewpoints of cross-cultural encounter: From Czech point of view, it is a very specific group (the author uses term „minority“, perhaps a bit exaggeratingly), not only because of their „Americanness“, but much more because of their „Evangelical culture“, with its particular sets of beliefs, values, habits and sociolects. From American point of view, the encounter of the Evangelical religious culture, deeply rooted in the American tradition, with the mostly secular and basically not-Church-going Czech culture, means significant difference from encounters with other similarly non-American, but less secular cultures. Both aspects of the cultural clash are worth of research.

As for usual academic objectives, the thesis of Anna Janoušková meets all necessary standards. The thesis is clearly structured; the theoretical and methodological background is perfectly defined; the interviews have been led with clear purpose and their outcomes are adequately described; and the list of references is comprehensive.

I have but one fundamental objection. The author does not differentiate enough between the academic and the confessional discourse. This non-differentiation is obvious particularly in the introduction, see formulations like „still, three quarters of the whole population today is non-Christian“ or „missionaries, the warriors of the Christian world“ (both page 6). Evidently, the author herself shares the worldview of the interviewed missionaries. Or, at least, she uses typical phrases from their sociolect without distance or clearance (such as: „As Evangelical Christians believe...“). This sharing is no defect. Firstly, „this is a free country“, as Americans love to say. Secondly, „engaged observation“ is a legitimate anthropological method (see the „Chicago school“). This lack of differentiation and self-reflection, however, means a sort of a defect, because the author unwillingly limitates her ability to describe properly both aspects of the cultural clash.

It is from this objection, where my only question for the author arises. I would ask her to explicitly describe her position in this aspect and to discuss the difference between discourses.

If this task will be fulfilled in a satisfying way, I propose the supreme evaluation of the thesis.

Prof. Martin C. Putna

August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2015